

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

CECILE A. BROWN,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

Case No. C20-5640-RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

*Pro se* Plaintiff, Cecile Brown, has been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this matter. Dkt. #2. She brings this action against the United States Board of Veterans' Appeals claiming emotional distress and defamation. Dkt. #3. Summonses have not yet been issued.

Plaintiff's complaint is difficult to decipher but appears to allege that the Board of Veterans' Appeals committed a tort related to Plaintiff not receiving "her finality of appeal which was closed then reopen[ed] due to . . . Administrative Error." *Id.* at 4. Under the Statement of Claim section, she states, "Give an Attorney 20% of Retroactive Pay when he was revoked evidence in RBA." She also claims that her rights were "grossly violated by government agents" and "deprived of a redress of grievances by sovereign immunity." *Id.* She cites both federal question and diversity of citizenship as the basis of jurisdiction. *Id.* at 3. Regarding damages,

1 Plaintiff requests \$500 million in emotional distress damages and \$500 billion for defamation.  
2 *Id.* at 5.

3 The Court will dismiss a Complaint at any time if the action fails to state a claim, raises  
4 frivolous or malicious claims, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from  
5 such relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).  
6

7 Plaintiff's request for at least \$500 billion appears frivolous. Plaintiff's claims, as stated  
8 in the complaint, also appear frivolous due to a lack of background detail. She cites no law or  
9 causes of action in her complaint other than generalized descriptions of "common intentional  
10 tort" and a reference to 38 U.S.C. § 7112, which provides for expedited treatment of remanded  
11 claims before the Board of Veterans' Appeals. *Id.* at 3-4. It is also unclear how venue is proper  
12 in the Western District of Washington, given that Plaintiff resides in Louisiana and Defendant is  
13 a government agency located in Washington, D.C. *Id.* at 1-2.  
14

15 Accordingly, Plaintiff's complaint suffers from deficiencies that, if not explained in  
16 response to this Order, will require dismissal. In Response to this Order, Plaintiff must write a  
17 short and plain statement telling the Court: (1) the laws or statutes upon which her claims are  
18 based; (2) exactly what facts support each of the alleged violations of law; (3) what specific  
19 injury Plaintiff suffered because of each alleged violation of law; and (4) why venue is proper in  
20 the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington. **This Response is not to exceed**  
21 **six (6) pages.** Plaintiff is not permitted to file additional pages as attachments. The Court will  
22 take no further action in this case until Plaintiff has submitted this Response.  
23  
24

25 Therefore, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff shall file a Response to this  
26 Order to Show Cause containing the detail described above **no later than twenty-one (21) days**  
27 **from the date of this Order.** Failure to file this Response will result in dismissal of this case.  
28

1  
2 DATED this 13<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2020.  
3

4   
5

6 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
7 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28